

Comments Related to the concept of off-site Mitigation.

1. How can ecological function be measured? What are the units of measurement?
2. Where else has off-site shoreline mitigation been used?
3. People for Puget Sound want this approach reserved primarily for maritime businesses.
4. People for Puget Sound is concerned about poor performance record of mitigation banking -- want to ensure no net loss of shoreline on private land.
5. Why not provide all mitigation (and over mitigate) on site?
6. Who decides if mitigation is on or off-site?
7. Is there a time limit on providing off-site mitigation?
8. Will the City require more mitigation off-site than it requires for on-site mitigation to compensate for performance problems?
9. Are mitigation requirements the same for hotels/restaurants as they are for water dependent uses?
10. This plan could create disaster by creating a shoreline with large hard-scaped areas & mitigation elsewhere.
11. Is there a distance "offsite" that is acceptable for mitigation – what defines "on-site" and "off-site"?
12. The ability of the public to review and possibly challenge the adequacy of required mitigation is compromised when mitigation is separated from the project site.
13. Off-site mitigation could be cheaper than on-site.
14. Look at mitigation values in different ways.

Comments related to design of restoration projects.

15. Lake Union is a complicated environment. The lake is polluted, contains refuse, debris, raw sewage – developers should not have to return Lake to pristine conditions when applying for permit approval.
16. Can off-site mitigation projects include remediation of known toxic areas in the Lake?
17. Will shoreline restoration projects address the issue salt-water intrusion into Salmon Bay?
18. Need to protect Salmon.
19. Could the salt-water shoreline west of the locks be part of mitigation area?
20. Need to push the science to identify mitigation projects that will work.
21. Plan creates a pool of knowledge and system of improvements.
22. Restoration projects will require ongoing monitoring.

23. Restoration projects implemented through this plan should not be on publicly owned land. Other resources exist to restore public land.

Comments related to permit processing

24. People for Puget Sound favors developing a streamlined permit process that starts with Salmon Friendly Design.
25. Is the City working with State and Federal permitting agencies in the development of this project? Will these other agencies go along with this approach?
26. Need to simplify permit process

Comments related to public access.

27. Will shoreline restoration projects include public access opportunities?
28. Public access should be part of this plan (for non water-dependent uses) – possibly combined with habitat sites.

Land use Comments.

29. What about Port of Seattle developing apartments?
30. Maritime industry & land are under assault.
31. City needs to understand value of maritime industry.